

HISTORY OF MONROE DOCTRINE

Extracts from President Monroe's Seventh Annual Message To Congress
December 2, 1823

..."In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers...

..."We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by an European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security."

The Monroe Doctrine was reasserted by President Polk in his first annual message to Congress December 2, 1845.

..."The United States, sincerely desirous of preserving relations of good understanding with all nations, can not in silence permit any European interference on the North American continent, and should any such interference be attempted will be ready to resist it at any and all hazards.

It is well known to the American people and to all nations that this Government has never interfered with the relations subsisting between other governments. We have never made ourselves parties to their wars or their alliances; we have not sought their territories

by conquest; we have not mingled with parties in their domestic struggles; and believing our own form of government to be the best, we have never attempted to propagate it by intrigues, by diplomacy, or by force. We may claim on this continent a like exemption from European interference..."

The French Intervention in Mexico during the period of the Civil War caused great concern in the United States, as reflected in the House Resolution of April 4, 1864.

"Resolved. That the Congress of the United States are unwilling, by silence, to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico; and they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government, erected on the ruins of any republics government in America, under the auspices of any European power."

Secretary Seward commented on proposed Austrian Intervention:

..."You inform me that it is expected that about one thousand volunteers will be shipped (under this treaty) from Trieste to Vera Cruz very soon, and that at least as many more will be shipped in autumn.

I have heretofore given you the President's instructions to ask for explanations, and, conditionally, to inform the government of Austria that the despatch of military expeditions by Austria under such an arrangement as the one which seems now to have been consummated would be regarded with serious concern by the United States...."

The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, now completely discarded, proposed a principle that since the U.S. permits no European nation to intervene in Latin American affairs, we must then assume the responsibility of preserving order and protecting life and property in those countries.

Annual Message from President Theodore Roosevelt to the United States Congress, December 5, 1905.

"There are certain essential points which must never be forgotten as regards the Monroe Doctrine. In the first place we must as a nation make it evident that we do not intend to treat it in any shape or way as an excuse for aggrandizement on our part at the expense of the

RECORD OF THE GOVERNMENT

the republics to the south. We must recognize the fact that in some South American countries there has been much suspicion lest we should interpret the Monroe Doctrine as in some way inimical to their interests, and we must try to convince all the other nations of this continent once and for all that no just and orderly government has anything to fear from us.

"There are of course limits to the wrongs which any self-respecting nation can endure. It is always possible that wrong actions toward this Nation, or toward citizens of this Nation, in some State unable to keep order among its own people, unable to secure justice from outsiders, and unwilling to do justice to those outsiders who treat it well, may result in our having to take action to protect our rights; but such action will not be taken with a view to territorial aggression, and it will be taken at all only with extreme reluctance and when it has become evident that every other resource has been exhausted."

President Wilson rejected the Roosevelt theory but reasserted the viability of the Monroe Doctrine in a memorandum from the Counselor for the Department of State (Robert Lansing):

"There is another method by which such power may be acquired, a method, which today can be more easily and more successfully employed than those to which the Monroe Doctrine has been in the past applied. It is a mode of extending political power, which, in my opinion, has caused much of the confusion and uncertainty as to the scope of the Monroe Doctrine because of its gradual development and the failure to recognize it as in practical conflict with that policy."

When by reason of commercial and financial domination a European power becomes undoubted master of the political conduct of an American republic, is a condition presented which may justify the United States in applying to it the Monroe Doctrine with the same vigor, with which it would have applied the Doctrine if the European power had by force or treaty established a protectorate over the American republic?"

Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State, made some important observations on the Monroe Doctrine on August 30, 1923:

"The Monroe Doctrine is not a legislative pronouncement; it has been approved by action of Congress, but it does not rest upon any congressional sanction. It has had the implied indorsement of the treaty-making power in the reservations to the two Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907, but it is not defined

by treaty and does not draw its force from any international agreement. It is not like a constitutional provision deriving its authority from the fact that it is a part of the organic law transcending and limiting executive and legislative power. It is not a part of international law, maintained by the consent of the civilized powers and alterable only at their will. It is a policy declared by the Executive of the United States and repeated in one form and another by Presidents and Secretaries of State in the conduct of our foreign relations. Its significance lies in the fact that in its essentials, as set forth by President Monroe and as forcibly and repeatedly asserted by our responsible statesmen, it has been for 100 years, and continues to be, an integral part of our national thought and purpose, expressing a profound conviction which even the upheaval caused by the Great War, and our participation in that struggle upon European soil, has not uprooted or fundamentally changed."

"First, the Monroe Doctrine is not a policy of self-defense."

"Second, as the policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine is distinctively the policy of the United States, the government of the United States reserves to itself its definition, interpretation, and application."

"Further, in its own declarations the United States has never bound itself to any particular course of conduct in case of action by other powers contrary to the principles announced."

"Third, the policy of the Monroe Doctrine does not infringe upon the independence and sovereignty of other American States."

"The Monroe Doctrine does not attempt to establish a protectorate over Latin American States. Certainly, the declaration that intervention by non-American powers encroaching upon the independence of American States will be regarded as dangerous to our own safety, gives no justification for such intervention on our part."

"Fourth, there are, indeed, modern conditions and recent events which can not fail to engage our attention. We have grown rich and powerful, but we have not outgrown the necessity, in justice to ourselves and without injustice to others, of safeguarding our future peace and security."

"Fifth, it is apparent that the Monroe Doctrine does not stand in the way of Pan American co-operation in the independence and security of American States."

"Finally

"Finally, it should be observed that the Monroe Doctrine is not an obstacle to a wider international co-operation, beyond the limits of Pan American aims and interests, whenever the co-operation is congenial to American institutions. From the foundation of the government we have sought to promote the peaceful settlement of international controversies."

The Department of State pointed out another important consideration under the Monroe Doctrine when Frank B. Kellogg was Secretary of State, December 17, 1928:

"Should it become necessary to apply a sanction for a violation of the Doctrine as declared by Monroe, that sanction would run against the European power offending the policy, and not against the Latin American country which was the object of the European aggression, unless a conspiracy existed between the European and the American states involved."

"It is evident that the Monroe Doctrine is not an equivalent for "self-preservation"; and therefore the Monroe Doctrine need not, indeed should not, be invoked in order to cover situations challenging our self-preservation but not within the terms defined by Monroe's declaration. These other situations may be handled, and more wisely so, as matters affecting the national security and self-preservation of the United States as a great power."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt completely changed the conception of U.S.-Latin American relations with his Good Neighbor Policy first expressed in his Inaugural Address, March 4, 1933:

"...In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor--the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others--the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors. We now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we cannot merely take, but must give as well..."

President Roosevelt also pointed out the emerging roll of the Western Hemisphere in world affairs which changed the original Monroe Doctrine theory that Europe should not become involved in the Western Hemisphere because the United States would not become involved in Europe.

"The American family of nations may also rightfully claim,

now, to speak to the rest of the world. We have an interest, wider than that of the mere defense of our sea-ringed continent. We know now that the development of the next generation will so narrow the oceans separating us from the Old World, that our customs and our actions are necessarily involved with hers."

The Monroe Doctrine merged itself into a thoroughly multilateral action by the American Republics as a result of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947:

Article 3, Paragraph 1

"The High Contracting Parties agree that an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States and, consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

Article 6

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental conflict, or intra-continental conflict, or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent."

Article 8

"For the purposes of this Treaty, the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radio-telephonic or radio-telegraphic communications; and use of armed force."

The Charter of the Organization of American States resulted in final U.S. renunciation of the Theodore Roosevelt intervention theory. The U S. bound itself to the following:

Article 17

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized."

Article 18

"The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defense in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfillment thereof."

The extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the communist threat was enunciated in an address by Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, April 26, 1950.

"In his proclamation of what later came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine, President Monroe declared that the political system of the powers in the Old World was essentially different from that of America, and "that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this Hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety." We are no longer concerned today with the political system of the Holy Alliance, based on monarchy and the exploitation of peoples kept in colonial servitude. We are concerned, however, with the alien political system of Communist Russia, based as it is on totalitarian dictatorship and the enslavement of populations at home and abroad. The Monroe Doctrine, has not lost its meaning with the passage of a century and a quarter, for, today, we consider any attempt to extend the Communist system to any portions of this hemisphere as "dangerous to our peace and safety." This attitude is still basic to our policy."

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, on April 14, 1958, explored the multilateral aspects of the Inter-American system:

"That (the Monroe Doctrine) was the first great proclamation of interdependence. It was, at its inception, a unilateral

proclamation